CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE. fornia a pack-horse, to be loaded down with whatever burden his allies may choose to place upon her back he would make her pay dearly for having incorporated into her Constitution that thing so hateful to him, the Proviso of Freedom He (Mr. W.) was for California separate from all other questions. He believed it due to that State, due to ourselves, and, shove all, required by the voice of a vast majority of the freemen from whom

we profess to speak and act.
What, Mr. Chairman, is the spectacle presented here? After having acquired all the slave territory upon the continent—after having annex-ed Texas in hot haste, and at the hazard of the war which followed that act; now, sir, the free State of California, with a voting population larger than that of one half of the slave States—larger than Florida, larger than Arkansas, larger than Texas, larger, in my judgment, than either Mississippi or Louisiana—this free State is denied admission into the Union, only because she is free. Yes, sir, her only offence is, that she has prohibited slavery within her borders. Those who now ask that action shall be had upon this subject, are denounced as men who desire to keep up a "miserable excitement" in the public mind. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] may, his conception of things, regard it as a misera ble vocation, for men to contend earnestly, serious ly, manfully, for the advance of Freedom, for the triumph of truth. The gentleman may regard acapting and which are rewarded with the smiles | weight upon the strong arm of some a consuction

" miserable agitation" indeed! to stand up here and battle against the selfishness of the day, to utter unwelcome truths in the ears of lordly masters, to expose the schemes of unchastened ambition, to labor earnestly to bring back this Government to the policy of its founders, to insist that the policy of Jefferson, and the fathers of the Republic, should be applied to the Territories of this Union.

he so much deprecates, might have been avoided. Had Representatives faithfully carried out the will of their constituents, the question of slavery in our Territories would have been settled three years ago, by the extension to them of that provision of the Ordinance of 1787 which prohibits slavery except for crime. Of this there can be no

He (Mr. W.) has said before, and he repeated House. One was that of the gentleman from Illinois, and the other that of his then colleague, now a member of the Senate, [Mr. Douglas] That provision, which the gentleman has learned from his Southern allies to denounce as most infamous, not only received the approval of the Representa tives from the free States, but the unanimous and spontaneous approval of the people throughout every free State in this Union. The people by every form of expression endorsed it. Legisla-tures by unnnimous resolutions endorsed it. Had the public voice then been faithfully obeyed in this and the other wing of the Capitol, all that excitement and agitation about which the gentle-man declaims with such genuine Southern feeling, rould have been avoided. The question would have been settled without agitation, without excitement; and, in my judgment, without leaving behind any very serious heart-burnings upon the feelings of our Southern friends. True, sir, they might have been ignorant of the merits of their distinguished champion, the gentleman from Illi nois. The country might have never known that it held within its bosom one of such broad, such comprehensive, such exalted patriotism. This, he (Mr. W.) confessed, would have been a serious loss to the country, and a great personal sacrifice to the gentleman from Illinois; but one which, he trusted, would have been cheerfully made, to avoid that agitation which so alarms and disturbs the

Mr. Chairman, It has become quite common for certain gentlemen, distinguished slike for their patriotism and modesty, to claim for themselves that they stand upon a broad and national platform; and to denounce all who do not take position with them, as narrow-minded, sectional, and This great doctrine of the universality of fre dom, as one the inalienable rights of man, and of the local character of slavery, as a State and sectional institution, constituted, in the early days of the Republic, an established article in the repub-Hence, the efforts of Jefferson to circumscribe the limits of slavery-efforts gloto the State which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] in part represents. But for this Ordinance, which the gentleman now denounces as infamous, the curse of slavery world have been settled without agitation, and without this protracted struggle, which some gentlemen profess to the curse of slavery world have been settled without agitation, and without this protracted struggle, which some gentlemen profess to the curse of slavery world have been settled without agitation, and without this protracted without agitation, and without this protracted without agitation. riously successful in the establishment of the Or-dinance of 1787—by which freedom was secured to the State which the gentleman from Illinois ces as infamous, the curse of slavery would have rested like an incubus upon his own State. It would have gone there in defiance of the Ordinance, had Illinois, at the time of the adop-tion of the Constitution, been blessed, or cursed, (her people will judge which,) with a superabundance of that broad and comprehensive patriotism of which the gentleman boasts. Instead of that free labor, which is fast giving to Illinois prosperity and greatness, the negro slave would loitered in idleness upon her facility loitered in idleness upon her fertile fields, or been driven by the lash to his thriftless and un-

He (Mr. W.) had followed in the footsteps of Jefferson; he had travelled in the beaten tracks of the fathers of the republican party. had been to circumscribe slavery within State limits—not to interfere with it there, but to resist its spread over the free Territories of the nation-to relieve the General Government from all responsibility for its existence or support, leaving it to rest, where alone it should rest, upon State sovereingty and State laws.

This question of slavery extension is a grea pecuniary question—a question of capital—or money. The immense capital invested in slaves money. The immense capital invested in slaves as effectually controls this Government as does the capital invested in the funded debt of Great Britain control that. The old proverb, that "money rules the world," is as true in political as in social affairs. The money invested in slaves wields the destinies of this boasted free Republic It shapes its policy to its own ends, it elects its Presidents, and dispenses its vast patronage; it proscribes its enemies, and exalts its friends. So far as legislation and all the machinery of Government is concerned, it in truth and fact con-stitutes the Republic itself. Well-informed Southern men in this and in the other branch of Congress have estimated the amount of money invested in slaves at sixteen hundred millions of dollars. He thought the estimate a large one but that the sum is large almost beyond computation, is certain. This vast money power, extending over half of the Confederacy, and binding together in the bonds of a common pecuniary interest half the States, dictates law to this Re public, and rules with a despotism unrelenting as death. As a Democrat, he had ever been opposed to great moneyed interests. The instincts of money are the same the world over—the same here as i the most grinding despotism of Europe. Money is cold, selfish, heartless. It has no pulse of humanity, no feelings of pity or of love. Interest gain, accumulation, are the sole instincts of its nature; and it is the same, whether invested in manufacturing stock, bank stock, or the black stock of the South. Intent on its own interest, it is atterly regardless of the rights of humanity. It would coin dividends out of the destruction of souls. Here, then, sir, we have sixteen hundred millions of capital—heartless, unfeeling capital intent on its own pecuniary advancement. It is here, sir, in these halls, in desperate conflict with the rights of humanity and of free labor. It is struggling to clutch in its iron grasp the soil of the country—that soil which is man's inherit-ance, and which of right should belong to him who labors upon it. Sixteen hundred millions of dollars demands the soil of our territories in per petuity, for its human chattels-to drive back the free laborer from his rightful field of enterprisefrom his lawful and God-given inheritance. Slavery must have a wider field, or the money value of flesh and blood will deteriorate. Additional security and strength must be given to the hold-ers of human stock. What though humanity should shrick and wail? Money is insatiate— capital is deaf to the voice of its pleadings. To oppose the extension of slavery—to resist in the money power-to advocate the rights of human ity and of free labor, is, in the estimation of the gentleman from Illinois, to be sectional, and fa-natical. To bow down to this money power—to to do its bidding—to be its instrument and its tool—is doubtless, in the esteem of the gentleman, to stand upon a "broad and national platform." Freedom and humanity, truth and justice, is a platform too narrow for his enlarged and comprehensive mind—the universality of slavery can alone fill its capacious powers. Slavery is Democratic—freedom fanatical! Sir, the gentleman no doubt sees fanaticism in a bold and fearless advocacy of the right. With some minds, nothing is rational and practical, except that which pays well. That slavery has heretofore paid well to those who labored in its service, he (Mr. W.) was prepared to believe. The history of this Government proves this. Its bills, however, have been at a discount since the Presidential election of '48. Its last draft for the Presidency

election of '48. Its last draft for the Presidency was dishonored. Its credit is shaken as a prompt

aster; and the gentleman from Illinois may

yet find himself in a fanatical position, expending his great powers, without adequate reward.

He (Mr. W.) was educated in the republican school. All his opinions upon political questions were strongly tinctured with the doctrines of that school. Nowhere in the teachings of the "fathers" had he found it laid down, that Democracy consisted in measurements.

sisted in wearing the collar of slavery about his neck—in bowing down to a heartless money aris-tocracy—in supporting the extension of slavery over the Continent. Such may be the doctrines of the gentleman from Illinois. He may best subserve his political ends, by standing shoulder to shoulder with the advocates of Slavery-Extension. He may esteem that man a demagogue who boldly stands up in the face of power, in defiance of all opposition, the advocate of truth, the inflexible supporter of principle. There are demagogues, however, who succumb to power; who flatter the strong, and deride the weak; who are always found in support of that policy best calculated to advance their interests; who are ready to change opinions with a change of dynasty; and who ever lean for support upon some strong, and, as they believe, controlling interest. The Slave Power has so long held ascendency in this Government. that certain gentlemen seem to think that their political fortunes are secure, only when they stand in close alliance with slavery. They lean upon it for support; they look to it for promotion; they tremble and turn pale at its frowns. Many fear to stand on the rock of Truth, unsupported save

Mr. Chairman, (he continued.) I am charged by the gentleman from Illinois with practicing the arts of the demagogue-with keeping alive a "miserable excitement," to secure by own elevation to office. When have I been found at the footstool of power? When have I addressed myself to propitiate its smiles or its favor? When have I abandoned principle, and taken this Union.

He (Mr. W) could tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] how this agitation, which he so much deprecates, might have been avoided.

He (Mr. W) could tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] how this agitation, which he so much deprecates, might have been avoided.

He (Mr. W) could tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] how this agitation, which he so much deprecates, might have been avoided.

He (Mr. W) could tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClernand] how this agitation, which he so much deprecates, might have been avoided. have redeemed the solemn pledges given to a thousand such as the gentleman from Illinois, than disappoint the just expectations of the now, that when the Proviso was first introduced, humblest man who gave me his confidence and there were but two Northern votes against it in this support. Does the gentleman from Illinois know anything about the district from which I come Has he ever informed himself as to the charac That ter and political principles of those I represent?

from For his information I will tell him, that it is one of the strongest Democratic districts in the State of Pennsylvania. If by Abolitionists he means a class of persons who assail the Constitution, and seek the overthrow of slavery by violent or unlawful means, then, sir, there are no Aboliticaists in my district. If by Abolitionists, the gen-tleman intends to be understood all such as are opposed to the extension of slavery, then, sir, we are all Abolitionists together. It is the most radical, thorough, inflexible Democratic district in the State; and has ever been true to the maintenance of the great cardinal principles of the Republican party—opposed to a high protective tariff, to a national bank, to extravagant schemes of internal improvement by the General Government, to a distribution of the proceeds of the public lands; and in favor of the independent treasury, and of every other measure with for the last twenty years. Nay, more : it took the

which the Republican party has been identified lead in Pennsylvania in support of many of these great questions. The Democracy of my district advocated the independent treasury, and a more liberal revenue policy, before either of those great measures had commended themselves to popular favor with the party in that State. I was with them then, I am with them now. It is a part of their faith, and a part which will not be not to be extended over the free soil of this cor tinent. They embrace this great principle as a part of their creed; and they will stand by it to the last, against all temptation, and in the face of fanatical. Is slavery national, and freedom sectional? He (Mr. W.) had been taught by the fathers of the republican school, that freedom was broad and national, and slavery local and section-al. For this great doctrine he had struggled prostration of their principles. The gentleman here, and for this he should continue to struggle, with all the feeble powers God had given him. When they are excluded from the Democratic That State will then have taken its position per-manently in the ranks of the opposition. But I do not believe that they will allow the gentlema

from Illinois to excommunicate them from the Democratic party; nor will the demonstations of the entire South movethem one jot or tittle from struggle, which some gentlemen profess to think endangers the stability of the Union, had the Representatives from the North faithfully carried out the will of their constituents. I do not intend this remark as a reflection upon the gentleman from Illinois. His district, for aught I know, may be as pro-slavery as himself. It is not my pur-pose, Mr. Chairman, to reflect upon the motives or conduct of any gentleman in this House. It would be out of order for me to do so; yet I cancontroversies is not by patched-up compromise which ought to have, and can have, no force, footsteps of The principles upon which this controversy should be settled are the same as those upon which all great political questions should be settled in a Government like our own - by an honest and faithful representation on this floor, and in the other branch of Congress, of the voice of our respective constituencies. Let every man vote as his constituents desire him to vote—as it was unelection to a seat in this Hall-then, sir, you would have expressed the voice of the country. A settlement upon such a basis would stand—would command respect. It would be in harmony with the spirit and genius of our institutions Upon this basis alone ought all great questions to be settled; and had it been faithfully acted upon, the present controversy would never have had an existence. The question of slavery in our Tersettled on the side of Freedom. But it would seem that a different atmosphere prevails here

from that which gentlemen breathe at home. We have here political combinations looking to the Presidency, and to the patronage dispensed from that high office. Men become the mere partisans of Presidential aspirants, instead of the faithful representatives of the People. Party interests and party success exert a controlling influence over the deliberations of Congress. It is but a short time since, when the Representatives from the North, who occupy seats on the other side of this House, were, to a man, the advocates of positive legislative prohibition against the extension slavery. Ay! sir, it was an "old principle of the Whig party! A devoutly-cherished doctrine They had always opposed the controlling influence of slavery in the Government! The Democracy had always courted and succumbed to the Slave Power." Such, but a short time ago, was the universal language of Northern Whigs in and out of this House. I well remember with what alacrity and zeal they walked up to the vote—always ready, always anxious. It was not then premature—there was no dodging in those days. Who so blind as not to see that a great change has come over the leaders of that party. and the representatives of that party on this floor After having obtained power by professions of signal and lasting devotion to Freedom, they now seek to retain it by compromises with Slavery. They are now willing to abandon the old policy of enforcing the Ordinance of 1787. Indeed, they have abandoned it for the "non-action" policy of the late Executive. The new dynasty, it is said favors a different policy; it is disposed, so says rumor, to take passage in the Omnibus, which has been lumbering its way for months through the Senate. If this be so, we shall soon see a corresponding change in the position of party leaders. Leaders can change to order—the People are not

> tees for Freedom — they want the Jeffersonian Ordinance respected. If, by the force of circum-stances, our Territories should be preserved from the threatened encroachments of Slavery, and finally be admitted as free States, (a result which non-action leaves to the hazard of chance,) still slavery will have triumphed, if we fail to assert the rights of freedom. The policy of this Govern-ment should be settled now and forever, sgainst

so facile. The masses expect nothing, ask for

nothing, from Government, except just and whole-some laws. They love principle, and follow it with earnest and honest purpose, unless misled by ambitious and selfish men. They want the old policy restored, they want securities and guaran-

hear me, and to the whole country. It will stand in hisory, and the shameful record will also be written, that some were faithless to those pledges—that they sacrificed principle and honor, to propitiate power. There are not three men from the free States, on the opposite side of the House, who, when elected, were not understood by their censtituents to be in favor of legislative action against the extension of slavery. The same is true of a large majority of the Democrats. know of some who gave their solemn pledges in writing, to stand by the principle to the last, and against all compromises, who have publicly de-clared their purpose to abandon it. This, sir, is shameful; yet it is by such treachery as this, that slavery is to gain a triumph. If the Ordinance of freedom is to be thus defeated, it is not by the voice of the people; it is defeated by the betrayal of their representatives. And is such a betrayal of high trusts to be dignified with the name of "compromise?" Do gentlemen expect such a settle-ment to stand? Is this the way in which peace is to be restored to the country? Are the people to be cheated, and then called upon to thank as public benefactors those who defrauded them? A distinguished Senator-he again who "treads no by a consciousness of rectitude and duty, who, step backward"—in a recent speech, labored earsendicine or unent weaking. A first their most, against that it was the duty of a reprethe minter of his constituents whenever, in his

by. He contended that the faithful representative—he who religiously observed his pledges, who faithfully and honestly, by his speech and votes, carried out in these Halls the views of his constituents-was a slave himself, and that a proviso was needed to free such a one from bondage Sir, neither great talents, nor exalted position, can sanctify such doctrines. They strike at the foundations of our system of Government. They are anti-republican, anti-American. The Senator himself gave us a shameful example of their mischievous influence, when he turned his back upon the unanimous instructions of his own State. I subscribe to no such sentiments. I tolerate no such dectrines, in politics or in morals. I can respect, may more, I can applaud the man who votes for slavery, when I believe he is fairly reflecting

for slavery, when I believe he is fairly reflecting
the principles and feelings of those he represents;
but I have only loathing and contempt for him
who, by false professions, obtains a high place,
and then betrays the confidence reposed in him.
Mr. Chairman, I do not desire agitation; but I
cannot consent to avoid it, by a tame and silent
submission to wrong. I will not see, without a
struggle to avert it, this Government, established
by the price of blood upon the great faundations struggle to avert it, this Government, established by the price of blood, upon the great foundations of Freedom, subverted to the accursed purpose of the extension of slavery. Its power shall never he wielded to such ends, if by any humble efforts of mine I can prevent it. So long as there can be found such men in the North, as the gentleman from Illinois, to stand here and do the work of slavery, so long there will be agitation-an agitation that, by-and-by, will reach the constituents of the gentleman, and light up the fires of Truth and Freedom in his district. When that day comes, as it surely will come, we shall hear no more of the gentleman from Illinois, and the like

A great truth cannot be trampled in the dustgreat principle of right cannot be broken down. Freedom will live-truth and justice will liveive in the hearts of men-live in the attributes of God-live forever.

This Government is not a government of slavery, but of freedom. We hold that slavery is not a national institution—that it should be kept within the limits of the States where it is tolera ted; and these are doctrines which no pretended compromise can crush-no political combinations

In the last Presidential contest, the South brought to bear the influence of this sixteen hundred millions of slave property. She declared that no man should receive her support for the Presidency who did not bow down in abject and slavish submission to this mighty power of the South. Northern aspirants for that high office of the reward. The price of shame and of humiliation was not paid, and I trust in God that it never will be paid. The ambitious and aspiring must learn that they cannot reach the Presidency by a base bowing down to the power of slavery. This lesson it is the duty of the people to teach them. This is the only remedy for doughfaceism-it is peaceful remedy-the remedy of the ballot-box. shall not fear to resort to it, whenever occasion

requires its application.
Mr. COBB, of Alaba Mr. COBB, of Alabama, (Mr. Wilmor yielding the floor) I wish to ask the gentleman if he would vote for any man for the office of President who was the owner of slaves.

Mr. WILMOT. Certainly sir-most cheerfully, if he agreed with me in principle. I make principle the guide of my political action. Principle, and principle alone, controls my votes; not the location of candidates, or the nature of the property they may hold.

Mr. COBB. Would the gentleman own a slave himself?
Mr. WILMOT. I have no wish to be the owner of one. God forbid that I should ever be placed in circumstances where my interests or conveni-Upon this subject I confess that my moral sensi-bilities are not as keenly alive to the wrongs of slavery as they ought to be. I am not so good a man as I wish I was. I wish that I could feel for the wrongs of others as keenly as I feel a wrong when inflicted upon myself. I make no pretension to any such exalted virtue. Gentlemen who have done me the honor to listen to my speeches upon this subject, will remember that I have never discussed this question in its moral aspects. That task I have left to others, better able to do it justice. I have examined it as a political question-as a question affecting the rights of the people, and the policy and character of the Government. Apart from all moral considerations, I am opposed to the further extension of slavery, as a political evil of the first magnitude. Slavery is anti-republican—it is aristocratic in all its ten-dencies and results—it is subversive of those great principles which lay at the foundation of all free Governments. It is a great moneyed interest— a vast pecuniary capital, with the heartless in-stincts of capital, and I am deadly hostile to the control of capital in this Government. It is in theory, and should be in practice, a Government of the people. It belongs to the free masses of the country. It is theirs to enjoy, to defend They have a right to mould it to their pleasure, to determine its policy, to direct it to the advancement of their happiness and prosperity. Slavery seeks to wield it to its own selfish ends—to the support and perpetuation of its vast capital in human flesh and blood. I oppose the extension of slavery, because it is an element of weakness in States. I speak with no feelings of unkindness towards the South, but I utter my earnest convictions when I say, that the South is weak—weak in all the elements of strength and greatness-weak to resist a foreign foe, and only weak because of the institution of slavery. It is the men who perform the labor of a country that must defend it in the hour of danger. The men who perform the labor of the South are slaves. You dare not place the means of defence in their hands. You dare not give them arms, and teach them their use, lest they turn them against yourselves. If your young and able-bodied men go to the field in large numbers, you leave your families, your women and children, exposed to a terrible enemy at home. It is an element of weakness in States, and for this reason I am opposed to its extension.

Another reason : notwithstanding the vast increase of slavery in the last sixty years, I enter-tain the hope so ardently cherished by our fathers, of its ultimate extinction. I look forward to some day—remote it may be—when the South, in its own way, and by its own voluntary action, set about the great work of emancipation, and the separation of the two races; in which work, I trust the North will cooperate to the full extent of its resources and power. The day must come, or there will be a night of terror and of blood. Slavery cannot be eternal. I cannot contemplate the prospect of perpetual slavery, without seeing the future of my country shrouded in darkness and in gloom. The extension of slavery will postpone the day of deliverance—magnify its difficul-ties, if indeed it does not make them insurmountable. Slavery I have before stated to be a pe-cuniary question—a question of capital, of dol-lars and cents. This is the light in which it is viewed by the master; to the slave it is a question of liberty, and of all a man holds dear and sacred. It will continue so long as it is valuable—so long will those who have property in it, hold on to sla-very with a grasp that cannot be broken. Every one acknowledges that slavery would become value-less much sooner, if confined to its present limits, than if extended over a wider space. This, South-ern gentlemen tell us, is the reason why they are determined to extend it; and they charge upon the rights of freedom. The policy of this Government should be settled now and forever, against
the further extension of slavery. This is renment should be settled now and forever, against
the further extension of slavery. This is read
the further extension of slavery. This is read
the further extension of slavery the startling demands of slavery, of its right to extend wherever the flag of
the Union floats.

But, as I was saying, our friends on the other
side have undergone a change; and I fear that
another and more sudden change awaits them.
General Taylor is dead. The brave and honest
old chief reposes in the grave. He has no more
old chief reposes in the grave. He has no more
fallen upon another. A late Senator, he who
"treads no step backmard," is elevated to the
premierable. Henceforth his word is to have a
magical influence and power. As Senator, and
Taylor living, it had lost its charm; as premier,
it is to be potential. I shall expect to see his dis
the rights of freedom. The policy of this government should and settled mow and forever, against the
met should be settled now and forever, against
the further extension of slavery constitutional provision in reference to the formation of States.

Mr. Sawaso (interposing.) Will the Senator to
the Union floats.

The pescedem will read for themselves, and
they will need no comment from me.

The speeches will read no comment from me.

The pesident, the objection which is a made to
the will the Senator for
Mary land.

Mr. Paart assented.

Mr. Paart asse

coveries in "physical geography" adopted by the faithful. We shall see, sir, what we shall see. Whatever course gentlemen may adopt, one thing is certain, that a large majority took their seats in the present Congress, pledged to the support of the Proviso. This fact is known to those who self become worthless as an element of property. They see clearly that at no distant day they will mence the work of emancipation, unless that day is put off by the opening of new fields for slave labor. Sir, I would not obstruct the operation of God's laws. I certainly would not interfere to save slavery from their influence. Looking, as I do, to the day of our ultimate redemption from this curse, I wish it to come before the evil shall have grown to such giant propor ions as to defy our efforts for a peaceful deliverance. I do not wish the evil to grow beyond our control. We might, by a mighty effort, solve peacefully, and without blood, the problem of slavery, with ten millions of blacks. No human power can solve it with fifty or a hundred millions. It would break in fragments the strongest Government on earth; it would produce scenes of commotion, strife, and blood, such as the world never saw. Why will gentlemen bring certain and wide-spread ruin and wide-spread ruin the spirit of selfupon the country? It is the spirit of self-ishness that invokes this destruction upon our land-the selfishness of great interests, the selfishness of capital, blind to everything but its immediate and proximate interest. For resistance to this spirit of selfishness, for seeking to avert from my country this terrible doom, I am assailed by the general and from the delication of the selection of the and studied denunciation.

people in the free States to resist, by every lawful and constitutional means, the extension of slavery.

They may be betrayed by their representatives— I fear they will be; they may, for a time, be mis-led by those in whom they have placed confi-dence—party leaders may lick the dust at the bid-ding of slavery, may kiss its bloody hands—party organization may be used to crush the advocates of liberty—yet, sir, the great heart of the people beats for freedom. Gentlemen will learn that a cheat is no settlement—that a betrayal of trust is no adjustment of difficulties—that the arrangements of Presidential aspirants is no compromise ments of Presidential aspirants is no compromise. Agitation is not to be quieted by the perpetration of wrong. The friends of freedom will counsel no resistance to established law; but they, will not cease to appeal to the judgments and the hearts of men, in behalf of righteousness and truth. Gentlemen want peace, quiet. Cease to urge a wrong, and you will have a peace. What is the quiet they want? Freedom from agitation on the subject of slavery. I will tell gentlemen how they can have quiet on this subject: Separate the General Government from all responsibility for the existence or support of slavery. Keep for the existence or support of slavery. Keep your institutions within your States, and you will have no agitation. Cease to exert the pranny of slavery in this Government—immolate no more Northern mes. You provoke agitation by the injustice of your demands. You declare your purpose to extend slav-ry into free territory, and when we offer resistance, when we demand for freedom the protection and security of law, you cry out against agitation. You ask us to reverse the policy of the Govern at in behalf of slavery and its interests, and because we refuse, you complain of injustice and wrong. We are struggling to maintain against your encreachments the to maintain, against your encroachments, the early and settled policy of the Government. I stand upon this question of slavery extension, where Jefferson, and Madison, and Henry, stood sixty years ago. Were they now living, they would advocate the policy I have advocated. They did so, in their day and generation. They would

It is the vast increase of this slave capital which has taken place in the last half century, that creates all our present difficulties. From two hundred millions of dollars it has grown to sixteen hundred millions. This immense capital is strughundred millions. This immense capital is struggling for perpetuity and power. It wishes to make slavery eternal. This is your fanaticism, gentlemen of the South—the fanaticism of slavery—of sixteen hundred millions of dollars! It is a cold, calculating fanaticism. It feeds on the souls and blood of men. Talk to me about fanaticism! May God preserve me from the fanaticism of slavery—from that fanaticism which forgets humanity and its rights, in the pursuit of an all absolutes. all-absorbing selfishness.

Mr. Chairman, I have been led almost uncon-

sciously into these protracted remarks. I con-templated but a few words when I arose. My object more particularly was to address myself to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. McClernand,] and to repel the charge brought by him against and to repel the charge brought by him against
the friends of freedom, of a desire to defeat the
appropriation bills. They have never entertained such a thought. They are loyal to the Constitution and to the Government of their country—loyat, sir, and true. They desire action on
California—that great question, which, more than
any other, engrouses the mind of the nation. It is a shame—a personal dishonor to Northern men—that California is not yet admitted into the Union. Why this protracted delay? Why this continual postpagement of a weekley? continual postponement of a measure which they all profess to favor? Are gentlemen afraid to act? Are we cowards, that we dare not perform our constitutional duty? Do we fear to take hold of the work which we came here to do? Sir, let us have done with this timid, this cowardly policy. Let us act. There is honor and safety in action-dishonor and danger in further delay. The gentleman from Illinois is waiting the action of the Senate on the "Omnibus bill." After eight months of the session is exhausted, he is for giving time for slavery to mature its plans. When slavery is in danger, the gentleman is ever ready and prompt in action. No measure of slavery was ever delayed an hour for want of the gentleman's aid. Freedom must stand back, and only enter these Halls in the manner and at the

hour slavery shall dictate.

I wish that the vote of to-day should arrest the attention of the country. Let it be known throughout the length and breadth of the land, that the consideration of California was postponed, to make way for an appropriation bill for the support of the Military Academy at West Point—a bill which there was no occasion for pressing upon our attention, and which could have been acted upon a fortnight or a month hence, without any detriment to the public service. This was done by the votes of the South, united with the great body of Northern Whiga, and a few Northern Democrats. California post-poned, after eight months' delay, by the strong vote of ninety-three to sixty! Yet, in the face of this vote, men will go home and try to make their constituents believe that they were friendly to the early and unconditional admission of Cali-

DEBATE ON THE "HIGHER POWER."

In the Senate of the United States, July 26, 1850 Mr. Seward having delivered a speech in sup port of his proposition to admit New Mexico as a State-

Mr. PRATT. I desire to say a word sir as t what I conceive to be the most extraordinary proposition ever submitted to this body. I apprehend that such a proposition would not have emanated from any other source than that from which it has come. I feel confident that when the yeas and nays are taken, as I intend to move before I take my seat that they shall be, the Senator from New York [Mr. Seward] will stand alone; because I am sure that there is no other member of this body who has at least advanced openly to the body his utter disregard of the Constitution and his oath to support it. Upon two occasions, as it is known to every member of the Senate, the Senator from New York has announced here that from the origin of this Government there have been two organized principles, warring one against the other, which must result in the course of time in the destruction by the more powerful of those principles of the other. The principle of human liberty, as he terms it, and the assumption in the Constitution of the universal equality of man, he has avowed to be the higher law, which he feels himself constrained to obey, although it may con-flict with the express provisions of the Constitution and his oath to support that instrument. For example, he believes and admits that the Constitu-tion of the United States positively prohibits the Congress of the United States from abolishing slavery within the States. Yet inasmuch as this slavery within the States. Yet inasmuch as this higher law, this principle of human liberty, comes in conflict with that constitutional prohibition, he says that he should be bound by this higher law, and he would disregard the Constitution of his country; he would disregard the oath which he has taken to support it before he took his seat here; and he would vote for that admitted unconstitutional act—the abolition of slavery within the States of this Union. I think, then, Mr. Presthe States of this Union. I think, then, Mr. President, that I am right in assuming that no other Senator upon this floor would have offered the proposition upon which I am now about to comment; because it is in every one of its features directly subversive of every constitutional provision in reference to the formation of States.

Mr. Seward (interposing.) Will the Senator allow me a word of explanation?

The Presupers Does the Senator from Many

that he has said and reiterated here that there is a law above the Constitution, which he felt bound to obey? Does he deny that?

to obey? Does he deny that?
Mr. Seward. Yes, sir, I deny that.
[Mr. S. states that he understood Mr. P. to have added the words, "when it conflicts with the Constitution," and replied accordingly—Rer.]
Mr. Pratt. Then, sir, he denies, Mr. President, what every man knows he has said. I have heard him say it over and over again; and the Senator's denial does not make untrue what I Senator's denial does not make untrue what i

nigher law.
Mr. Seward (in his seat.) I do not deny that Mr. Pratt. I call upon every Senator who hears me to say whether the Senator from New York did not say there was a higher law; a higher law than the Constitution, which he felt bound to obey when it came in conflict with the

Mr. SEWARD (in his seat) I did not

Mr. Seward (in his seat) I did not.
Mr. Pratt. I call upon any Senator upon this
floor, other than the Senator from New York, to
deny that he said so.
Mr. Baldwin. As the appeal has been made
to other Senators, I must say, simply, that I did
not understand the sentiment uttered by the Senator from New York as it has been stated by the ator from New York as it has been stated by the

Senator from Maryland.

Mr. Foots (in his seat.) Everybody else did.

Mr. Pratt. I do not know what the Senator from Connecticut means by this disavowal. If he means that my commentary upon what the Sena tor has said is not exactly correct, that may be so.

law than the Constitution which he fest cound

Mr. Baldwis. I happen not to have a copy of the speech of the Senator from New York here, and I cannot of course be expected to give the precise words. I understood the Senator to state that there was a higher law than the Constitution, which was in harmony with the provisions of the

Mr. PRATT. Now, Mr. President, it will be in Mr. Pratt. Now, Mr. President, it will be in the recollection of every one who hears me, that in the second speech which was made by the Senator from New York—one which displays all that preparation which I think every Senator should give to everything they are about to utter in this body—which, if it had been displayed in a better cause, would have been worthy of his country—he reiterated the sentiment contained in his first speech, and then uttered the sentiment I have stated, that there were two antagonist principles ingrafted originally in the Constitution, and those two antagonist principles were the alleged equality of man and the principle of domestic slavery—the recognition of domestic slavery.

Now, Mr. President, he avowed further, and I think that every one here will agree with me, that

whenever these antagonist principles of which he was speaking came in conflict with the Constitution, the higher law would be obeyed by him in preference to the Constitution itself. I have spoken of this matter to all the friends of that spoken of the matter to all the friends of that Senator, and this is the first time I ever heard any one say he understood him differently from what I have stated. I have mentioned it to them with the announcement of the intention on my part to move the expulsion of that Senator as a member of this body. I have stated that when that Senator took his seat here, he was bound, as we were, to comply with that article of the Constitution which says that Senators, before they take their seats, shall swear to support the Con stitution. I have said to them that if, when he came to the book to take that oath, if he had re-fused to take the oath, he could not have taken his seat; or if he had promulgated to the Senate the reservation which he now makes or has hith-erto made, with reference to this superior law, so as to make invalid that oath, there is not a Senator that would have permitted him to take it. Therefore, sir, if he had not concessed his under-Therefore, sir, if he had not conceated his understanding of the obligations which he was about to take upon himself, he would not have been permitted to take his seat here. I contended for this with his friends, and none of them said I was wrong in the facts. I contended that with these opinions we ought to turn him out of the body, as he never should have taken a seat here.

President, I now come to the amendment, which is this: Insert after the word "That," in the first line,

the following:
"New Mexico shall, on proclamation by President of the United States, be admitted as a State into this Union, on an equal footing with the original States. Provided, That the President, the original States. Provided, That the President, before issuing such proclamation, shall be satisfied vention of New Mexico has been approved and ratified by the people of New Mexico in the elec-tion held for the purpose of considering it, on the 20th June last.

20th June last."

Here, then, sir, is a proposition that Congress should admit New Mexico as a State into this Union with a Constitution which Congress has never seen, establishing boundaries not known to the Senate or to any one else; that we should di-rect the President of the United States to proclaim the admission of New Mexico as a State with whatever boundaries she may choose to assume, even if they include half or two-thirds of Texas and whether that Constitution is republican in its form or not, provided he shall believe that the people of New Mexico are willing. Therefore, if they have established a Government not republican in its form—a kingly Government—the provision of the Constitution which says that we shall admit no State which is not republican in its form, or if by its boundaries it includes a part of Texas, that provision of the Constitution which prohibits separating from the limits of any State, without the assent of that State, are to be disre-garded, and New Mexico is still to be admitted as a State by proclamation, although she does segregate parts of other States without the assent of those States, and although her Constitution may not be in a republican form. Am I not right, then, in saying that no one—except the Senator from New York—entertaining his opinions, could submit a proposition like this? Am I not right in saying that there is no Senator upon this floor— and I ask the yeas and nays to see if there is any one-who will vote for an amendment directly violative of these two clauses of the Constitution

to which I have referred? Mr. President, I have desired upon all occaions, and I am sure that it is still my determination, to cultivate toward my brother Senators feelings of harmony and respect, so far as I am capable of entertaining them. I will not say—I will not pretend to say—that such feelings can be entertained by me with reference to such a proposition as this, or to the member of the Sen ate who made it.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President-THE PRESIDENT. Did the Senator from Maryland ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. PRATT. Yes, sir. Mr. Dayron. Mr. President, I have a request-THE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until it is ascertained whether the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were then ordered.

Mr. Dayron. After the yeas and nays are dered, the request that I have to make cannot complied with. I meant merely to ask the Sena tor from New York whether it would not be bet ter for him to withdraw his proposition.

Mr. CLAY (in his seat.) I object. Mr. PRATT (in his seat.) The year and nays

Mr. SEWARD. If there is any proposition I have ever made, any measure I have ever proposed, which I am witting to stand by here, before the country and the world, it is the proposition I have now submitted. Therefore, though I stand alone, I shall be content, convinced that I stand

l do not propose to reply to what is personal to myself in the remarks of the honorable Sens tor from Maryland. I have nothing of a personal character to say. There is no man in this land who is of sufficient importance to this country and to mankind to justify his consumption of five minutes of the time of the Senate of the United

minutes of the time of the Senate of the United States, with personal explanations relating to himself. When the Senator made his remarks, I rose to express to him the fact that he was under a misapprehension. The speeches which I have made here, under a rule of the Senate, are recorded, and what is recorded has gone before the People, and will go, worthy or not, into history. I leave them to mankind. I stand by what I have said. That is all I have to say upon that subject.

The Senator proposes to expel me. I am ready to meet that trial too; and if I shall be expelled, I shall not be the first man subjected to punishment for maintaining that there is a power higher than human law, and that power delights in justice; that rulers, whether despots or elected rulers of a free people, are bound to administer justice for the benefit of society. Senators, when they please to bring me for trial, or otherwise, before the Senate of the United States, will find a clear and open field. I ask no other defence than the open field. I ask no other defence than the

against the admission of New Mexico, which is, that the Constitution of New Mexico may be one creating a kingly Government, if the honorable Senator does not disdain to examine a Constitution not officially laid before the Senate. It begins with these words:

"We, the people of New Mexico, in order to establish instice, promote the welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity"—

This, so far, is the language of the Constitu-

tion of the United States. Then it proceeds to utter what the Senator from Maryland will consider a dangerous heresy: "Acknowledging with grateful hearts the goodness of the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe, and imploring His aid and direction in its accomplishment, do ordain and estab-lish the following Constitution:"

We see that here are a people who acknowledge a higher power than the Constitution.

Mr. Paatt (interposing) Does the Senator mean to say that I consider that a heresy?

Mr. Seware. I say that the Senator charac-terized what I said as heresy when I expressed recisely this opinion.

Mr. PRATT. Will the Senator yield the floor

Mr. Seward. Certainly; but I give the Senor notice that I shall make no answer. Mr. PRATT. Mr. President, when one asserts, am sorry to say, what he knows to be untrue—

SEVERAL SENATORS. Order! order! Mr. Pratt. I beg pardon, Mr. President— Mr. Seward. I hope the Senator may be per-

Mr. PRATT. I was about to say, that when a senator makes an application to myself which is Senator makes an application to myself which is Members, that I wish to advert to I do not correct, with the satering which I can say will in-

vself should induce me to say h Mr. Seward. These people of New Mexico then say they have "established a Government then say they have "established a Government for the purpose of establishing Justice, securing the blessings of Liberty for themselves and for posterity, and that they acknowledge the superintending power of the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe, and invoke His blessing."

Now, let us see what kind of Government they make. They form themselves into a free and independent State, by the name of New Mexico. The next question is whether they have established a "kingly" Government. This may be learned from their declaration of rights:

earned from their declaration of rights:

learned from their declaration of rights.

"Ail men being born equally free and independent, and having certain intural, inherent, and inalienable rights, amongst which are the erjoying and defending of life and liberty, the acquirement, possession, and protection of precty, and the pursuit of and attainment of happiness: therefore no male person shall be held by law to serve any person as a servan', slave, or apprentice after he arrives at the age of eighten years; unless they be bound by their own consent, after they arrive at such age, or are bound by law for punishment of crime.

"All power is inherent in the people; all free Governments are founded in their authority; they have therefore an inalienable and indefensible right to institute Government, to alter and reform, or to totally change the same, when their safety or happiness requires it."

Well, sir, so for have

tions of 1640, of 1688, and the American Consti-tution of 1776. Well, have they established a King, with an hereditary aristocracy to exercise the powers of government? No, sir; quite the contrary:

the powers of government? No, sir; quite the contrary:

"The powers of the Government of the State of New Mexico shall be divided into three distinct departments, and each of them confided to separate bodies of magistracy, to wit: Those which are legislative to one; those which are indicisi, to another; and those which are executive, to another.

"No person or collection of persons, being of one of those departments, shall exercise any power properly belonging to either of the others, except in those instances hereinafter expressly directed or permitted.

"The legislative powers of the Sta'e shall be vested in two distinct branches; one to be styled the Senate, the other the House of Representatives; and both together the Legislature of the State of New Mexico. The style of all laws shall be, Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico.

"The members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen by the qualified electors, and their term of office shall be two years from the day of their general election; and the session of the Legislature shall be held annually, at such time as shall be prescribed by law.

"The Senators shall be chosen by the qualified electors for the term of four years, and shall be divided by lot into two classes as nearly equal as may be.

"The Governor and Leutenant Governor shall be elected by the qualified electors of the State, at the time and places of choosing members of the Legislature.

"The Judges of the Supreme Court shall be appointed by the Governor, with the consent of both Heuses of the Legislature in joint ballot; and shall hold their offices for the term of six years, and until their successors be duly nominated and qualified?"

"A general diffusion of knowledge being essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, it shall be the daty of the Legislature of this State to make with the provisions for the support and maintenance of public schools.

'The Legislature shall, at as early a day as practicable, establish free schools throug

public schools.

'The Legislature shall, at as early a day as practicable, establish free schools throughout the State, and shall furnish means for their support by taxation; and it shall be the duty of the Legislature to set apart not less than one-twelfth of the annual revenue of the State, derived from taxation, as a perpetual fund, which fund shall be appro-priated to the support of free public schools, and no law shall be made diverting said fund to any other use. "Every male person of the age of twenty-one years or upwards, (Africans or the descendants of Africans, and un-civilised indians, excepted,) belonging to either of the fol-lowing classes, and who shall have resided in this State for six months next preceding any election, shall be a qualified elector at such election: "First. Citizens of the United States residing in this State

"First. Citizens of the United States residing in this State
"Second. Persons who elected to remain citizens of the Republic of Mexico according to article eighth of the treaty of peace, made and concluded between the United States of North America and the Republic of Mexico, at Guadalupe Hidalgo, and ratified by the Congress of the United States the thirtieth day of May, A. D. 1848, and who shall have taken, at least six months preveiling any election, before some judge of the Supreme Court in this State, are not fore a cirk o any court of record in this State, an oath remouncing and abjuring all allegiante or fealty to the Government of the Republic of Mexico, and to support the Constitution of the United States and of this State.

"Third. Persons of foreign birth, not referred to in the two preceding clauses, who shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, conformably to the laws of the United States on the subject of naturalization.

ration. "No soldier in the army of the United States shall be en-titled to vote in this State." This, then, is the Constitution of New Mexico

It is a republican Constitution, and the argument of the Senator from Maryland against the admision of New Mexico is refuted. Mr. DAYTON. It is no part of myduty to make

any comment upon any course which any Senator may think in his best judgment to be advisable; but I cannot but feel that when we are acting jointly in reference to a measure, we have some thing in common, and that there is something due to each other; and it seems to me that it would have been better if the Senator from New Would have been better if the Senator from New York had consulted the views of those who have concurred generally in their action upon this measure, and have avoided offering this proposition at this time. This amendment belongs altogether to a different line of policy, and the whole effect of offering it at this time is to put the vote before the country infinitely feebler than if the proposition were to stand alone. Why, sir, I cannot vote for this amendment, while at the same time I do not want to yote against the admission. time I do not want to vote against the adm of New Mexico as a State, as an alternative. I cannot vote for this amendment to the bill; and I put it to the Senator from New York, what is the put it to the Senator from New York, what is the effect of this amendment, supposing you pass it and incorporate it in this bill? Why, sir, you adopt your own amendment, and this main line of policy; and the Senator himself and others will have to vote against the Omnibus bill. Now, in what position are we placed? I submit, with very great respect, that it would have been better and easier not to have mixed up this question with the Omnibus bill. Let us stand alone upon our own or a different policy. I do not wish to vote for this bill. I do not wish to vote against the admission of New Mexico as a State, under proper circumstances, as a mere alternative.

of New Mexico as a State, under proper circumstances, as a mere alternative.

But I am unwilling to vote for this amendment for another reason. I do think this matter is premature. I am unwilling to transfer to the President of the United States, or to any other which the Constitution power on earth, that right which the Constitution has imposed on us to judge whether the Constitu-tion of a State offering herself here is republican or not. The Constitution of the United States makes it accessary that Congress should pronounce upon that question. How, in the name of God, can we transfer that constitutional duty to the Executive, and then satisfy our consciences and our constitutional obligations to that Consti-tion? I cannot do that yet.

tion? I cannot do that yet.

Again: I am unwilling to place the onus of judging the question of boundary, and other provisions of this Constitution, upon the President. This amendment only says that if the President shall be satisfied that the people of New Mexico have approved of some Constitution, (what Constitution it does not say, and we do not know, because the paper from which the Senator has read has no official character,) he shall admit them as a State by proclamation. State by proclamation.

State by proclamation.

Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senator should have felt it his duty to embarrass us in this matter. I do not complain of it, because he has exercised only his just and legitimate rights upon this floor. The effect of this thing is to drive those to vote against New Mexico, with the admission of California, who, if the question were separated and stood alone, and she, with her republican Constitution, properly authenticated, came forward, would feel themselves bound to vote for it. I cannot vote for her in this bill because for it. I cannot vote for her in this bill, because, if the amendment were adopted, you would drive a large number of Senators to vote against it. It

New Mexico, in a convention held on a certain day for that purpose. The Constitution will then come up for our adoption. I stated in the outset that it was not myself who was responsible for the premature presentation of the proposition—that this bill, if it passes, is a bill which is to shut the doors against New Mexico when she shall come here with her Constitution in her hands, and with her delegates here, to maintain and support here her delegates here, to maintain and support her rights. She is turned adrift without making her rights. She is turned adrift without making her appearance, and therefore it is that I am prepared, for one, upon the information I have, to go for her admisssion in order to secure her her rights. Other Senators may set as they in their discretion may think right and proper. They will have their own reasons, I have no doubt, to justify themselves to their constituents in regard to the vote they shall give.

Mr. Halk. I concur with the honorable Senator from New Jersey in what he has said in restor from New Jersey in what he has said in re-

Mr. Halk. I concur with the honorable Senator from New Jersey in what he has said in regard to the amendment of the Senator from New York, as a reason for not voting for it. I cannot vote for the proposition for another reason, which he has not adverted to; and that is, because those of us who have contended against the piling of incongruous measures in one bill, should preserve our consistency, if it is worth preserving, (I do not myself consider it of any very great value,) and go against increasing the load; for if California's back was bent by what was already piled upon it, this certainly would not lighten the burden. For that reason I would have preferred that this proposition should have been presented in a different shape. ferent shape.

But there was one remark of the Senator from

suggested his expulsion. If it be the announcement that there was a higher law than the Constiment that there was a higher law than the Consti-tution, and which we are bound to obey at all times and at all hazards, I myself ought to be ex-pelled, because I believe it. I thought when the Senate went into the choice of a chapiain to per-form the ceremony of offering prayer and sup-plication, that we did recognise that there was a higher Power over us, and I have not heard of late years that it was a crime to recognise a power higher than human power.

higher than human power.

Mr. Pratt (in his seat.) No one denies that.

Mr. Hale. I do remember, recorded in ancient and sacred history, an occasion somewhat analogous to this. It is recorded that on a certain occasion should be a serial occasion. gous to this. It is recorded that on a certain occasion the princes and governors and mighty men
of the realm got together, and suggested to the
king of Babylon to publish a decree that whoever should put up any prayer or petition to any
other than the king, for the space of three days,
(it was limited to three days only, let it be
remembered.) should be cast into a den of
lions; and I have not heard that that decree was enforced but three days. The operation was such that it never was renewed in the kingdom of Babylon; and I have never heard of any country, civilized or savege, where it has been a crima to acknowledge, as individuals or as members of an organized Government, that there is a Power higher than your Constitution—that there is a King of kings, and a Lord of lords, before whose face the stubborn pride of the Republic must bend the knee.

Mr. Foots. Mr. President, will the Senato

Mr. Hale. I will get through in a moment.
Mr. Foore. It is only a short question.
Mr. Hale. Now, sir, I wish this thing to be put distinctly before us. I wish we might, as individuals, understand whether it is necessary to a seat on this floor for us to put the provisions of our Constitution above the behest of the King of kings. what an idle mockery it is to stand up and reverently kiss the Holy Book, and sall upon Him to help us to maintain its precepts, when in our hearts we maintain that our Constitution is above even His supreme authority! Sir, if this is crime, I am criminal. If the Senate is to be expurgated of everybody who believes that sentiment, let the work commence, and let it commence now. Let of everybody who believes that sentiment, let the work commence, and let it commence now. Let the preamble show the offence of which they are guilty; that is, that they believed, high and exalted as the sentiments they entertain of the wisdom and power of the Constitution which our fathers formed—that they irreverently believed that there was a Power higher even than that power, to which republicans as well as kings must bow in submission. If it be a crime, sir, I plead guilty to it. I will not put the Senator from Maryland nor anybody else to the trouble of proving it. I admit it, I believe it. Sir, I believe that you have no right even to bring the supremacy of your Republic into conflict with the commands of the Most High. I believe that sentiment in its broadest sense, and I have heretofore supposed that in the action of our Governmen and the sentiment of our Government, we had not, in the plenitude of our power and in the unbribled state of our pride, come to that pitch of presumption that it was to be considered an offence against the Constitution to bow reverently to the

power of the Most High.

Mr. Pratt. It is a very easy matter, sir, when an argument based upon one state of facts is made, to answer it by making an argument upon another state of facts which was never dreamed of by the party who made the argument in the first case. Does the Senator from New Hampshire say in his place that he understood me to say I did not believe in a Supreme Power—that I objected to the Senator from New York for looking to a Supreme Power as a higher law than any human law? Did the Senator so understand wer of the Most High. any human law? Did the Senator so understand me? He knows he did not; and yet he has got me? He knows he did not; and yet he has got up here, in the manner in which he usually argues, using a set of phrases which, however well they may suit certain occasions, and however they may exhibit the talents of the author of them, will not apply to every occasion, and have not just as much application to one state of facts as another. He assumes the facts to suit the phrases, and not his speech to suit the facts.

Now, sir, I never said; and I am sure there is not a Senator who hears me who does not believe that I have a higher respect for that Supreme

that I have a higher respect for that Supreme Power, whose name is so frequently desecrated here, than the Senator from New Hampshire. Mr. HALE. Order!

[The Reporter feels called upon to state that he understood the Senator to say " whose name is so frequently desecrated by the Senator from New Hampshire," and so he took down the words at the instant they were uttered; but, upon further reflection, considering that the sentence would have been incomplete by inserting the preposition "by," and that by the Senator's letting his voice fall after the word " New Hampshire" he intended to finish the sentence, the Reporter is forced to the conclusion that his ear

was mistaken.] The PRESIDENT. The Senator must not make Mr. PRATT. I have not made any. Mr. Hale. I call the Senator to order. Mr. Pratt. I have yet to learn that telling

the truth is out of order.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator will take his eat until the question of order is stated by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. Halk. I understood the gentleman to say that I frequently desecrated the name of the Most High.

Mr. FOOTE (in his seat.) He did not say so.
The PRESIDENT. The Senator from New
Hampshire will reduce his words to writing. Mr. Halk, having reduced the words to writing, passed them to the Chair.

The PRESIDENT. The words, as written down

by the Senator from New Hampshire, are, that "the name of the Most High is frequently desccrated by that Senator."

Mr. Hale. I have not had time to put down the connection in which they occurred, but that is a part of the language I understood him to

Mr. PRATT. I said "so frequently desecrated in the Senate."

Mr. Chase. May I be allowed to suggest that

Mr. Chase. May I be allowed to suggest that the words heard by the Senator from New Hampshire were, "so frequently desecrated here."

The President. The Chair will make its decision, and then it will be in order for gentlement to appeal from it if they choose. The words set down by the Senator from New Hampshire, applying a remark of this character to an individual Senator, would certainly be out of order; but the Chair did not so understand the Senator from Maryland, or he would have felt it his day to call him to order, as the Chair rarely shrinks call him to order, as the Chair rarely shrinks call him to order, as the Chair rarely shrinks from what he believes to be a discharge of his

duty.

Mr. Halk. I hope it will be understood by

Mr. Hale. I hope it will be understood by the Senate that the words I have taken down were not intentionally misunderstood. I put them down as they struck my ear and the ears of several gentlemen in my vicinity.

Mr. Paart (resuming) Now, Mr. President, the higher law of which I spoke was not the Divine law to which the Senator refers; and before they can apply that Divine law so as to suffer the Senator with whom this dispute originated to be exempted from the position in which he is placed, his advocates here must assume this: that the Constitution of the United States, which violates the law of the Supreme Being, and that therefore a person may swear to support that, although he does violate it, with the mestal reservation that he is to support it so far as he does not violate it. Now, the whole result of the position in which the advocates of the Senator over the way place themselves is the one which I have stated. I conceive that his position is not altered for the better from that which is taken by his advocates. Now, if the

[SEE SECOND PAGE.]